
Transportation and Communications Committee
of the
Southern California Association of Governments
November 27, 2007

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE. AN AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The Transportation and Communications Committee held its meeting at the SCAG office in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Alan Wapner, Chair. There was a quorum.

Members Present

Baldwin, Harry	San Gabriel
Beauman, John	Brea
Becerra, Glen	Simi Valley
Bias, Alex	CVAG
Bone, Lou	Tustin
Burke, Yvonne	Los Angeles County
Carroll, Stan	La Habra Heights
Chastain, Kelly	SANBAG
Daniels, Gene	Paramount
Dixon, Richard	Lake Forest
Dunlap, Judy	Inglewood
Edgar, Troy	Los Alamitos
Glancy, Thomas	VCOG
Gross, Carol	Culver City
Hack, Bert	Laguna Woods
Hernandez, Robert	Anaheim
Lowe, Robin	Hemet/ RCTC
Lowenthal, Bonnie	Long Beach
Martinez, Sharon	SGVCOG
Masiel, Andrew	Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians
Messina, Barbara	Alhambra
Millhouse, Keith	Moorpark
O'Connor, Pam	Santa Monica
Ovitt, Gary	San Bernardino County
Parks, Bernard	Los Angeles
Pettis, Gregory	Cathedral City
Quirk, Sharon	Fullerton
Rutherford, Mark	Las Virgenes/Malibu COG
Smith, Greig	Los Angeles
Spence, David	Arroyo Verdugo COG
Stone, Jeffrey	Riverside County
Ten, Mike – Vice Chair	South Pasadena
Wapner, Alan - Chair	Ontario

Adams, Steve
Aldinger, Jim
Ayala, Luis
Brown, Art
Buckley, Thomas
Chlebnik, John
Dale, Lawrence
Flickinger, Bonnie
Gabelich, Rae
Garcia, Lee Ann
Glaab, Paul
Green, Cathy
Gurule, Frank
Jahn, Bill
Leon, Paul
McLean, Marsha
Mills, Leroy
Nuaimi, Mark
Roberts, Ron
Sykes, Tom
Waronek, Mark

Riverside, WRCOG
Manhattan Beach
SGVCOG
Buena Park
Lake Elsinore
WRCOG
Barstow
Moreno Valley
Long Beach
Grand Terrace
City of Laguna Niguel
OCCOG
Cudahy
SANBAG
SANBAG
North L.A. County
Cypress
SANBAG
Temecula
Walnut
SBCCOG

New Members Not Present

None

Voting Members, Not Elected Official

Casey, Rose

Caltrans

1.0 CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLIGANCE

The Hon. Alan Wapner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments at this time. Note: a public comment card was submitted after the onset of the meeting. The speaker made his comment during discussion of Item 12, Orangeline.

3.0 REVIEW and PRIORITIZE

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval Item

4.1.1 Minutes of October 4, 2007 Meeting

It was noted that the Hon. Alex Bias name was excluded from the members' present list of the October 4th meeting.

A MOTION (Hon. John Beauman) was made to APPROVE the Consent Calendar. The motion was SECONDED (Hon. Keith Millhouse) and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 2008 Regional Transportation Program (RTP)

Hon. Alan Wapner, Chair, stated that the recommendations on the RTP Workshop Wrap-Up matrix were the projects that were brought forward from the six workshops that were previously held throughout the region. If there is a project a member of the Committee would like to see in the matrix it can be introduced but only if it has a source of funding. Some of the projects on the matrix will have to be removed regardless of their importance. However, as important as some of the projects may be, it will be up to this Committee to prioritize and decide which projects will move forward subject to funding constraints. Today's meeting was initially scheduled to approve the Draft RTP. Staff has informed me that the Draft of the RTP will not be ready in time. As a result of this the time-line will be extended. A special meeting of the TCC has been scheduled for November 27th at 9:00 a.m. at SCAG to further discuss the draft RTP. Prior to the meeting on the 27th the members of the TCC will have received a draft copy of the RTP for their review. The TCC will take action on the Draft RTP at its meeting on December 6. Any projects that are removed from the Constrained Plan will make their way into the Strategic Plan.

Funding

Item 1 – Congestion Pricing: A region-wide pricing strategy used to address congestion and emissions starting in 2015. It was concluded at the workshops, and by staff and legal counsel that congestion pricing is not at the point where it can be included in the RTP.

Item 1 will be included in the Strategic Plan and continue further study.

Item 2 – Increase in State & Federal Gas (\$.10/per gal.) Excise Tax: Based on historical data staff predicts that the region will experience an increase in gas tax.

At the special meeting of the TCC on the 27th, staff will provide a list of policies the TCC has adopted previously and any new policies that have been adopted.

The Legislative Program should include that any new taxes designated to transportation should be committed to transportation only.

Item 2 will be considered as part of the Funding Constrained Plan.

Item 3 – Indexing of State & Federal Gas Taxes: Based on historical data there is no way this can be included in the RTP, and the Federal Government would accept not accept this as a source of revenue under the Constrained Plan.

Item 3 will be placed in the Strategic Plan and continue further study.

Item 4 – Highway Tolls: The proposal is to include highway tolls for new corridors that are created, not for existing corridors. The tolls are assumed for the 710 Tunnel, 710 South (Truck Lanes, CETAP Riv-Orange, and High Desert Corridor.

Item 4 will be included in the Constrained Plan (specific project generated tolls).

Item 5 – Container Fees:

Two years ago UC Berkley did a major study on elasticity for SCAG. It included looking at what the results would be if the region charged container fees. The study looked to see if the Southern California region would lose freight to other regions or to other ports. The study did find that if the region charged up to \$200 per container and use the money to build infrastructure, that the diversion if any, would be minimal. SB-974 (Lowenthal) currently in Sacramento. Staff is assuming that to be consistent with its assumptions to not go over the \$200 that the study reflected could be charged.

An institution will have to be created that has the authority to collect and expend fees. The region has five County Transportation Commissions which have put together a Memorandum Agreement that will allow the CTS's to jointly spend the money should there not be an institution already in place to administer the fees.

Item 5 will be included in the Constrained Plan (no more than \$200/container per SCAG's Port & Modal Elasticity Study).

Item 6 – Local Option Sales Tax Extension for Imperial County: \$816 million (2011-2035) for Imperial County.

Item 6 will be included in the Constrained Plan.

Item 7 – Local Option Sales Tax Imposition for Ventura County: If Item 7 comes to fruition it can then be brought forward into the RTP as an amendment.

Item 7 will be included in the Strategic Plan and continue to work with Ventura County.

Item 8 – Value Capture Strategies: The value capture strategies that are appropriate to specific projects, which are roughly 10% of the total capital cost in the RTP will generate approximately \$400 million to partially offset public contribution needs for the 710 Tunnel.

Item 8 will be included in the Constrained Plan.

Item 9 – Private Equity Participation (PPP): The policy statement is that this will be applied wherever applicable. There are some projects that are depending 100% on public-private partnership. The potential funding source total, including existing sources, is approximately \$380 billion dollars.

Item 9 will be included in the Constrained Plan for new projects, not selling of public assets.

Goods Movement

Item 1 – Freight Rail: Item 1 will include tier-four locomotives for the rail expansion, the grade separation, and the clean technology. With regards to clean technology, the State Implementation Plan which SCAG recently submitted to the ARB did commit the Region to the tier-four engines by 2014.

Item 1 is to include clean technology strategies as a package with grade separations and rail expansion in the Constrained Plan.

Item 2 – Truck Lanes:

SCAG is about to release an RFP for goods movement studies which will include truck lanes that will deal with which route, when it can be implemented, and how much the engineering will cost. A multi-county study that was just completed recommended the SR-60 as the route and recommends further consideration of other aspects. One-third of the funding cost by tolls, the other two-thirds would be from container fees.

Item 2 will include the I-710 portion in the Constrained Plan. It will also include the SR-60 and I-15 portions in the Strategic Plan.

Item 3 – Alternative Technology Conveyance for Freight Only Component (Maglev freight movement):

Item 3 will be included in the Constrained Plan (per discussion at Workshop on passenger HSRT), subject to the region securing a partnership to fund the project. All the projects that are goods movement related which are included in the Constrained Plan are paid for by a combination of container fees and available public funds. Staff has used an assumption that about 40% of the total capital cost will be off-set by container fees. 40% of the \$18 billion comes from container fees.

Item 4 – Inland Port:

SCAG has commissioned a study that informed the region that there are potential areas for an inland port but action would have to take place to move quickly to secure the land. Based on the study, Inland ports require 500-700 acres. Within the region there is no where this acreage is available other than Victorville and Barstow. Staff will inform the Committee further of the cost of this item at the November 27th meeting of the TCC.

PUBLIC COMMENT - Peter Okurowski, Consultant, Association of American Railroads, recommended to Staff that some specificity be added to the Inland Port item and that if the item is going to be in the constrained portion of the draft, SCAG should have a discussion with BSNF and UP about the Inland Port .

Item 4 will be included in the Constrained Plan (consistent with recommendation for Alternative Technology Conveyance for Freight Only Component).

Corridors

Item 1 – Operations and System Preservation: This item is to maintain the existing infrastructure with an additional \$66 billion through 2035. Whatever money that is left over will go to preservation and maintenance.

Item 1 will increase the level of funding in the Core RTP by up to 40% (\$10 billion) above current commitments, recognizing capital investment tradeoffs.

Item 2 – I-710 Gap Closure with a tunnel, at a cost of 11.8 billion dollars when completed.

Include in the Constrained Plan.

Item 3 – High Desert Corridor: MTA has not voted on their priority list yet nor have they released the MTA's plan, consequently SCAG is still waiting on a commitment. Staff is working with MTA to secure some money for the corridor. Both the RCTC and OCTA have indicated they would like to work with SCAG to move the corridor project forward. SANBAG has committed to the project.

Question - If there are projects in the plan that does not make the funding constraints what does that do to the conformity issue and other issues concerned with the RTP?

Brad McAllester, Metro, responded that MTA would be going through its long range process from January – June 2008. There are a number of projects in the corridor category that are not currently in the current adopted funding program. There is a limited amount of money that will become available through this process and ultimately the MTA Board will make a decision on the projects and the plan around June 2008. Within the context of this, SCAG will have to make decisions without having certainty from the MTA Board regarding which projects are being funded.

Question - If Item 3 is approved for the RTP and MTA decides not to fund it because of limited funds, is SCAG prepared to come up with alternates to replace the project to make sure that conformity is maintained?

Hasan Ikhata responded that it was the CTC's responsibility to ensure that projects that are pulled from the RTP are replaced by other project. The corridor projects on the RTP matrix have been put there because staff feels that for the region to work, a region that is growing by 6 million people; these types of projects are needed. The question then is can the region pay for the projects. Yes, because the region has a deficit of \$23 billion dollars. You can commit to doing everything that is possible to move the projects forward, but the commitment and communication has to start at a high level between the executives of the CTC's and the SCAG policy committee chairs.

Question – If a significant project is pulled on December 6th that is going to compromise conformity, how will staff adapt to that?

Hasan Ikhrata responded that he would recommend that the TCC move Item 3 out of the Constrained Plan because if the project is not part of a conforming plan and federal or state money becomes available, these two levels of government can tell the region to spend it. For example, in the CETAP the region currently has a \$15 million federal grant that has been allocated to projects and there is still money left over. If the TCC decides to not include Item 3 the region can spend the left over money.

Sue Kaiser, FHWA, clarified that if the TCC chooses to elect to put a project in the Constrained Plan and there is no funding for it, and subsequently the project does not come through, this will require that the entire RTP be re-circulated and adhere to the new conformity determination. Whereas, if the TCC is not sure about the project and puts the project in the Strategic Plan instead, it would then be a matter of doing an amendment, thus the region would not jeopardize the money equation of the full RTP. If the region has a project included before the FHWA and if the FHWA makes an air conformity finding and the determination is that the funding is not available, the region is putting the FHWA in a position where it would not be able to approve the RTP and make a conformity determination. Whereas if the project is really questionable and is put in the Strategic Plan, SCAG can always go back and amend it and not jeopardize having the region not have a conforming RTP.

Question – Item 3 is in the existing RTP and if the project is removed, can the region continue spending the federal study funds the region has?

Sue Kaiser responded that if the funding was for a corridor or planning study those projects are more appropriately to be included in the region's work programs. But if the study is for environmental work, project implementation, or preliminary engineering, it would have to be in the TIP and constrained RTP.

Hon. Alan Wapner clarified that the region has federal funds that are committed through local agencies and the money cannot be spent unless it is in the RTP. Unless the region considers a source of funding for the entire project it can not be included in the RTP. The recommendations of the workshops have been to include both projects in the RTP subject to funding constraints by the date of adoption or circulation of December 6, 2007. If the region does not have the funding commitments of the agencies involved, then the project is removed from the RTP.

Question – Is there an opportunity to not jeopardize the federal money and keep the PE work going by including the project in the RTP as PE only.

Sue Kaiser responded that the issue the FHWA has is that in order for the project to be in the TIP the financial wherewithal has to be demonstrated to construct, operate, and maintain. Under federal criteria you have to go from PE to construction within 10 years and right-of-way within 20 years. This covers the period that is covered for the RTP. To have the project in the TIP the region would have to have the full funding in the constrained RTP.

Staff reminded the TCC that the region's conformity lapses June 8, 2008. The schedule to get the RTP adopted does not give the region even two extra days for recirculation. As a result, recirculation would put the region out of conformity. SCAG requested that this project be an item that is discussed in the 1246 Consultation. The issue needs to be debated between OCTA, RCTC and SCAG and then either inform the TCC that the region is okay with losing federal money or the region is going to commit some how in the next 20 years in the horizon of the plan.

Item 3 will be included in the Constrained Plan.

Item 4 – CETAP Riverside County-Orange County Corridor

Because of the similarity of constraints, discussion of Item 4 was taken up along with Item 3.

Item 4 will be included in the Constrained Plan.

Item 5 – I-5 HOV and Truck Lanes

Item 5 will be funded through developer fees and state money.

Item 5 will be included in the Constrained Plan.

Item 6 – US-101 Corridor

Item 6 will be included in the Strategic Plan and continue further study.

Transit Policies

Item A – Transit Reliability and Performance: Develop a policy to encourage the use of new technologies to monitor, enhance, and report transit system reliability and performance.

Seek funding in the next OWP (FY08-09).

Item B – Transit Service Levels: Regional and local operator transit service policies should be assessed to determine how to optimize service levels to achieve maximum potential use of our transit investments.

Seek funding in the next OWP (FY08-09).

Item C – Fare Policies, Fare Media, and Subsidies to Transit: A fare policy should be analyzed to assess the proper level of fares and subsidies to maximize transit use in the region.

Seek funding in the next OWP (FY08-09).

Item D – Increase Transit Connectivity: Regional and local operator transit services policies should be assessed to determine how to optimize connectivity to regional centers, and facilitate intermodal transit service to achieve maximum potential use of our transit investments.

Seek funding in the next OWP (FY08-09).

There was no discussion by the TCC on the above items.

Transit Projects

Item 1 – Extension of Expo light rail from Culver City to Santa Monica
Include in the Constrained Plan.

Item 2 – Crenshaw Corridor: Transit Corridor Technology/Mode Undetermined
Include in the Constrained Plan.

Item 3 Regional Connector: LRT connection into LAX complex by extending the existing Green Line
Include in the Constrained Plan.

Item 4 - Orange Line BRT Extension: Orange Line BRT Extension from Canoga to Chatsworth.
Include in the Constrained Plan.

Item 5 – Green Line LRT Extension: LRT connection into LAX complex by extending the existing Green Line.
Include in the Constrained Plan.

Item 6 – Gold Line Extension: Phase 1: Phased Extension SMV to Azusa II. Phase 2: Azusa II to Montclair. Phase 3: TBD.
Include Phases 1 & 2 in the Constrained Plan. Include Phase 3 in the Strategic Plan. Seek additional State and Federal funds.

Item 7 – Purple Line Extension: 1: Phased Extension Western to La Cienega. Phase 2: La Cienega to Century City. Phase 3: Century City to UCLA and beyond.
Include Phases 1 in the Constrained Plan. Include Phase 2 & 3 in the Strategic Plan. Seek additional State and Federal funds.

Item 8 – Metrolink Strategic Plan: Strategic investments in additional track capacity signaling, station capacity, cars, locomotives, support facilities, and new service levels to maximize ridership potential.
Include the Metrolink Strategic Plan in the RTP Strategic Plan. Pursue funding commitments to include these components in the core RTP.

Item 9 – Temecula Extension Metrolink: Extend Metrolink from South Parris to Temecula.
Include in the Constrained Plan. Seek additional State and Federal funds.

Item 10 – San Jacinto Extension Metrolink: Extend Metrolink from South Parris to San Jacinto.
RCTC has committed to Item 9 & Item 10.
Include in the Constrained Plan. Seek additional State and Federal funds.

Item 11 – LOSSAN Strategic Plan: Systemic Capacity and Service improvements on the LOSSAN Rail Intercity Rail Corridor.
Include committed portions in the Constrained Plan. Include uncommitted portions in the Strategic Plan. Seek additional State and Federal funds.

Item 12 Orangeline (Orangeline Development Authority): 108-mile grade separated, elevated Maglev down the Pacific Electric ROW through central Orange County to L.A. Union State out to Santa Clarita and Palmdale. The Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA) is a JPA made up of cities from L.A. and Orange County. The financial plan calls for private funding for most capital costs.

Item 12 was originally brought to the TCC as a high-speed transit corridor project. The recommendation from the workshops and the Maglev Task Force was that it be brought into the transit discussion because it appeared that there were too many stops in a short distance to be included for high-speed. Item 12 appears to be a light-rail transit corridor project instead.

Hon. Kirk Cartozian, City of Downey and Chairman of the Orangeline Maglev Authority deferred to his colleague Hon. Troy Edgar, Los Alamitos, for comment. Mr. Edgar stated that the Orangeline is a high-speed rail project that goes between Irvine and Palmdale. It is a \$42 billion project. The Orangeline uses Maglev technology and is outside of the Maglev Task Force that is currently housed by SCAG. The Orangeline started at SCAG in early 2000 but is now its own JPA and has 14 member cities across L.A. and Orange County.

There are two concerns the Authority has as to where the project has been placed in the RTP: 1) The project got moved to Transit Projects. If you look at the projects that are represented in the plan when you are competing against Metrolink and extensions of operating systems that do move passengers from short distances and you read the description and compare it to projects listed in the High-Speed Rail Regional Transport one can see that the other projects are probably more represented. 2) Moving the project from the RTP where it has been since 2004 and placing it into the strategic plan is the same issue that was discussed previously which has to do with maintaining to pursue, within the short-term, the right-of-way and the environmental impacts using the same data as the current IOS projects that are represented as using to validate themselves.

Mr. Edgar asked that the TCC give Item 12 the same treatment that the other Maglev projects received.

Hon. Richard Dixon stated that MTA, like OCTA, is not interested in pursuing a Maglev type system along that particular corridor. Mr. Dixon stated that he supported that the project stay in the Strategic Plan because it is a very important transit corridor for Orange County. The corridor could potentially link up the central portion of Orange County to the current Green Line that would run to LAX. Mr. Dixon stated that he felt it was misleading to include a connection up to Palmdale as part of the Orangeline because that is already in play within the Regional Maglev System.

Hon. Kirk Cartozian, Downey, stated that Item 12 was not a competing project to the other projects under consideration by SCAG in the Constrained RTP. This is a privately financed model and if it cannot be financed privately the project will fail.

The project was originally in the 2004 RTP and the Orangeline Maglev Authority took direction from the 2004 RTP and created its own Joint Powers Authority (JPA). Both Palmdale and Santa Clarita are member cities. Removing the project from the Constrained RTP is a slap in the face to the 14 cities that have committed themselves thus far.

Sue Kaiser explained what the FHWA is looking for with privately financed projects. Ms. Kaiser stated that the Business Plan had demonstrate how the project would be brought to fruition. For private funding, FHWA's guidance is the letters of commitment that are required from the private agencies. Ms. Kaiser inquired as to other than the JPA, what other stances have been made to actually secure funding? Mr. Cartozian responded that the project was not privately financed by corporations or businesses but by the ridership model of passengers and cargo and noted that the models have been submitted to SCAG. Mr. Ikhrata stated that when a project is put into the RTP the steps on how the project will be brought forward needs to be specifically noted. There is no transportation system in the world that would be able to pay for itself with just ridership therefore other sources of funding needs to be available to this project.

Mr. Edgar informed the TCC that there is currently a placeholder in Orange County and with the MTA for this right-of-way. Within the OCTA right-of-way there is no plan viable that has actually been served up to be using the right-of-way.

Hon. Robert Hernandez, Anaheim, informed Chair Wapner that he would abstain from voting on Item 12, on November 27, due to a conflict of interest.

Include in the Strategic Plan. Conduct Alternatives Analysis as to appropriate mode and technology options.

High-Speed Regional Transport

Item 1 - Initial Operating Segment (IOS): Fully grade – separated, elevated High-Speed Regional Transport (HSRT) system that operates primarily within freeway corridors. The 63-mile adopted IOS is from West L.A./LAX to L.A. Union Station to West Covina to Ontario Airport.

Include in the Constrained Plan.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Need to identify source of public subsidy for environmental work. 2) Form JPA for the IOS. 3) Form public-private partnership. 4) Secure funding. 5) Technology selection.

Item 2 – IOS Extension from Ontario to San Bernardino: 18-mile extension connecting Ontario the San Bernardino.

Include in the Constrained Plan.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Need to identify source of public subsidy for environmental work. 2) Form JPA for the IOS. 3) Form public-private partnership. 4) Secure funding. 5) Conduct Preliminary Engineering (PE) for IOS Technology selection.

Hon. Greg Pettis, Cathedral City, stated that he wanted to make sure Item 3, in the Strategic Plan, is also going to Palm Springs International. Chair Wapner said the suggestion was made at the last workshop but thus far nothing has been submitted for a plan to connect to Palm Springs. Mr. Wapner stated that if RCTC has any backup documentation it should be brought forward to the TCC so the project can be included in the RTP.

Item 3 – Anaheim-Ontario: The Anaheim to Ontario segment is 32-miles and takes approximately 18 minutes. This link would connect commuters from Riverside County to job centers in Orange County and shift air passengers from John Wayne Airport to Ontario Airports.

Anaheim-Ontario is a corridor that was included in the Cal-Nevada Plan that was submitted with the 2004 RTP. The original plan was to go from Las Vegas to Primm, Primm to Barstow/Victorville/Ontario and terminate in Anaheim. The region is asking that this corridor be put in the RTP for further discussion. The region needs to find a way to get air passengers to Ontario Airport other than by private owned vehicle. The project is premise is based on Maglev technology.

Include in the Constrained Plan.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Need to identify source of public subsidy for environmental work. 2) Secure funding. 3) Form public-private partnership. 4) Feasibility and planning studies needed. 5) Form partnerships with OCTA and/or CNSSTC. 6) Select route to Inland Empire (SR-91 or SR-57). 7) Conduct a feasibility study that examines possible intermediate stops.

Item 4 – Spur from the IOS mainline to the San Pedro Bay Ports: The 18-mile freight-only spur connects the San Pedro Bay Ports to the IOS at Hobart Yard, which is a few miles east of Union Station. From Hobart Yard to San Bernardino the IOS ROW will serve both passenger and freight traffic.

Include in the Constrained Plan.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Need to identify source of public subsidy for environmental work. 2) Secure funding. 3) Form public-private partnership. 4) More in-depth engineering and design work. 5) Form partnerships with stakeholders.

Item 5 –Long-term HSRT (post 2035) system: The following routes will be further studied: LAX-South (Orange County down Interstate 405), LAX-Palmdale, Irvine to San Bernardino to Victorville, Victorville to Palmdale, and March Airport to San Diego. Feasibility studies have been completed for the LAX-South and the LAX-Palmdale routes, but more in-depth analysis is needed.

Include in the Strategic Plan.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Secure funding. 2) Form public-private partnerships. 3) Feasibility and planning studies needed. 4) Form partnerships with stakeholders.

Item 6 – Orangeline (Orangeline Development Authority): 108-mile grade-separated, elevated Maglev down the Pacific Electric ROW through central

Orange County to L.A. Union Station out to Santa Clarita and Palmdale. The Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA) is a JPA made up of cities from L.A. and Orange Counties. The financial plan calls for private funding for most capital costs.

Remove from the HSRT matrix and include in the Transit matrix.

Item 7 – Ontario Airport to California/Nevada stateline Maglev: As a portion of the 269-mile grade-separated Maglev System from Anaheim to Las Vegas, Nevada, the Ontario to California/Nevada stateline segment would like the outlying Inland Empire with the central part of the SCAG region. The finance plan is to garner federal funding for capital construction.

The region is not responsible for the Nevada portion. Construction from stateline to Las Vegas is within the jurisdiction of Nevada.

Include in the Strategic Plan with the exception of the Anaheim/Ontario Corridor.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Secure funding. 2) Form public-private partnerships. 3) Feasibility and planning studies needed. 4) Form partnerships with OCTA and CNSSTC. 5) Select route to Inland Empire (SR-91 or SR-57).

Item 8 – California High Speed Train (serving the SCAG region) (California High-Speed Rail Authority): 700-mile steel wheel statewide high-speed rail network that will serve the Bay Area, Sacramento, the San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles, Orange County the Inland Empire and San Diego. The portion of the system in the SCAG Region connects Palmdale to Union Station and Anaheim. There is also a link from Union Station east to Riverside and south headed to San Diego. The system would compete directly with air travel for the long-haul interstate trips.

The high-speed rail plan is a link between Northern California and Southern California. Even though Southern California is only responsible for construction in the region, the entire plan needs to meet federal constraints for funding. There is a Bond that is on the November ballot that will fund a portion of the Business Plan. The Anaheim/Ontario portion is already in the RTP. The IOS between the Inland Empire and L.A. is already in the RTP.

OCTA has already committed funds to the Anaheim/L.A. project. If logical termini are established for the project it can be put in the plan. There will be some local funding but most funding will come from the local Bond that is on the November ballot.

Hon. Alan Wapner recommend that the Anaheim/L.A. corridor be included in the high-speed rail portion of the RTP and put the rest of the project in the Strategic Plan.

Include in the Constrained Plan, with the following conditions:

1) Southern California must be included in the initial construction. 2) A study looking at alternative technologies (Maglev and other systems) must be undertaken for the Southern California portion. 3) A detailed constrained financial

plan must be presented to ensure Southern California funding is spent on Southern California segments.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Secure funding via passage of state bond(s). 2) Complete EIS for various segments. 3) SCAG should continue its partnership with CHSRA.

Hasan Ikhata stated that SCAG had a meeting with the California High-Speed Rail Authority and after the meeting received a letter from the Rail Authorities staff saying that they would be able to meet condition 1 & 3, but not 2. With regard to reopening the study on alternative technologies the Rail Authority is not comfortable with doing this.

Question – What happens if the Bond measure does not pass? FHWA would not go back and pull the plan's conformity determination. But the FHWA would propose that the next time the region makes an amendment to TIP or RTP the region would have to resolve the financial issue. When the RTP comes to the FHWA for initial approval and conformity determination it is based on facts and assumptions that are in place at that time. If the region made a decision to include a project to circulate in December and then in January something resulted that withdrew some of the funding, then the RTP would need to be re-circulated for a new conformity determination. When SCAG submits the RTP to the FHWA on May 8, 2008, the FHWA will then take action then.

Since 2004 there have been 3 RTP Amendments and 22 TIP Amendments.

Jose Martinez, Southern California Representative for the High-Speed Rail Authority, stated that if the Bond on the November ballot does not pass, the Authority would evaluate what the Region's condition would be with the other funding the Authority is seeking. The Authority is seeking federal funding, private funding, and local funding. The Authority is beginning the process to enter into a cooperative mode, similar to the one with OCTA and SANBAG.

Locally any improvements that are planned or designed, primarily in the L.A. to Anaheim corridor, are improvements that are beneficial to the region with or without the high-speed rail. The LOSSAN corridor will benefit from any improvements such as grade separations or additional tracks.

Hon. Alan Wapner clarified for the TCC that he was not looking at the project as a high-speed rail request, he is looking at the project as an OCTA request because the Authority has requested that the project be put in the RTP.

Hon. Alan Wapner asked if there was any opposition to add the Anaheim/L.A. corridor in the high-speed rail portion of the RTP and put the rest of the project in the Strategic Plan.

There was no opposition.

Aviation

Item 1 – Aviation Task Force Preferred Scenario with Extended IOS and Anaheim to Ontario HSRT segment: Complete Extended IOS portion of adopted HSRT system with Anaheim to Ontario segment and implement market incentives for aviation decentralization.

Include in the Constrained Plan.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Same as for the entire HSRT long-term system, but with emphasis on developing terminal-to-terminal airport linkages in in-depth engineering and design work and feasibility and planning studies for HSRT.
2) Complete HOV/Flyaway study and develop recommendations on utilizing existing and planned investments in HOV and rail facilities to decentralize aviation demand to suburban airports.
3) Continue to coordinate with the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) to implement the Regional Aviation Decentralization Strategy through ground access, legislative and marketing strategies.

Item 2 – Aviation Task Force Preferred Scenario with entire HSRT system, with Anaheim to Ontario segment: Complete entire adopted HSRT system with Anaheim to Ontario segment that is necessary to reach 170 MAP and implement market incentives for aviation decentralization.

Include in the Strategic Plan, mid-and long-term.

Requisite Milestones:

1) Same as for the entire HSRT long-term system, but with emphasis on developing terminal-to-terminal airport linkages in in-depth engineering and design work and feasibility and planning studies for HSRT.
2) Complete HOV/Flyaway study and develop recommendations on utilizing existing and planned investments in HOV and rail facilities to decentralize aviation demand to suburban airports.
3) Continue to coordinate with the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) to implement the Regional Aviation Decentralization Strategy through ground access, legislative and marketing strategies.

Item 3 – Aviation Task Force Preferred Scenario with no HSRT:

No HSRT implementation but implement market incentives for aviation decentralization.

Do not include in the 2008 RTP.

Requisite Milestones: 1) Complete HOV/Flyaway study and develop recommendations on utilizing existing and planned investments in HOV and rail facilities to decentralize aviation demand to suburban airports.
2) Continue to coordinate with the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) to implement the Regional Aviation Decentralization Strategy through ground access, legislative and marketing strategies.

Hon. Alan Wapner informed the TCC that MAP figures were available on SCAG's website. The MAP in Item 1 runs around 64 MAP, which is an 8 million annual passenger loss from a fully implemented high-speed rail throughout the

region. It was also noted that the Aviation Plan was fully dependent on high-speed rail.

Growth Strategies

Staff announced that the Growth Strategies were unanimously approved at today's meeting of the CEHD and forwarded to the TCC for its approval.

Hon. Alan Wapner stated that he wanted to defer to the CEHD's recommendation since it is the CEHD that does the study and research of the Growth Strategies which are to be included as a chapter in the RTP. After its review if any of the TCC members have any questions they can be brought up at the November 27th meeting of the TCC.

A MOTION (Hon. Bert Hack) was made to provide staff additional direction on the development of the preparation of the Draft 2008 RTP. The MOTION was SECONDED (Hon. Richard Dixon) and APPROVED. Hon. Robert Hernandez abstained on any project involving Pacific-Electric Right-Of-Way.

5.2 Draft Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Chapters

Hon. Alan Wapner requested a correction, the RCP Chapter in Transportation shows electrification of rail. This has been eliminated from the region's program in the RTP and request that it be eliminated from the RCP as well.

A MOTION (Hon. Richard Dixon) was made to release the Preliminary Draft RCP Transportation and Security & Emergency Preparedness chapters. The MOTION was SECONDED (Hon. Jeff Stone) and APPROVED.

5.3 2008 State & Federal Legislative Program – Draft

Item 5.3 was postponed until November 27th to allow the TCC to further review the Legislative Program.

Hon. Richard Dixon made the comment that he had a concern with an item on page 52 that read 'seek legislative actions that promote the goals and objectives of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Dixon objected to this because it elevated the RCP beyond the advisory document that it is supposed to be.

6.0 AVIATION TASK FORCE REPORT

There was no report.

7.0 MAGLEV TASK FORCE REPORT

Hon. Lou Bone reported that on October 11th there was a joint meeting with the Aviation Task Force to review the RTP. On October 12th the task force made a visit to General Atomics in San Diego and had a demonstration of the Maglev test track operation. One of the proposals they made is they are looking at a public private financing partnership. In

the next week or two the task force will be taking a tour of the American Maglev operation in Atlanta. The next meeting of the task force is December 13.

8.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

No items.

9.0 CHAIR'S REPORT

Hon. Alan Wapner reminded the committee of the upcoming (final) RTP workshop to be held November 27th at 9:00 a.m. at the SCAG office. The Committee should receive a draft copy of the RTP prior to the 27th.

10.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No items.


11.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

12.0 ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. Alan Wapner adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

The next committee meeting will be held on **Tuesday, November 27, 2007 at the SCAG office in downtown Los Angeles.**



Rich Macias, Manager
Transportation Planning Division

Transportation and Communications Committee Attendance Report

2007

Member (including Ex-Officio) Last Name, First Name		Representing	X = County Represented						X = Attended			= No Meeting NM = New Member											
			IC	LA	OC	RC	SB	VC	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec			
Adams, Steve		Riverside, WRCOG				X						X											
Aldinger, Jim		Manhattan Beach		X						X							X						
Ayala, Luis		Alhambra		X							NM						X						
Baldwin, Harry		San Gabriel		X							X						X						
Beauman, John*		Brea									X						X						
Becerra, Glen*		Simi Valley		X							X						X						
Bias, Alex		CVAG					X										X						
Bone, Lou*		Tustin			X						X						X						
Brown, Art*		OCTA								X							X						
Buckley, Thomas*		Lake Elsinore					X																
Burke, Yvonne*		Los Angeles County		X							X						X						
Carroll, Stan		La Habra Heights		X							NM						X						
Chastain, Kelly		SANBAG						X									NM	X					
Chlebniuk, John		WRCOG					X					X					X						
Dale, Lawrence*		Barstow										X	X				X						
Daniels, Gene*		Paramount		X							X						X						
Dixon, Richard*		Lake Forest									X						X						
Dunlap, Judy*		Inglewood		X								X						X					
Edgar, Troy*		Los Alamitos		X													X						
Flickinger, Bonnie*		Moreno Valley					X					X	X										
Gabelich, Rae*		Long Beach		X								X	X										
Garcia, Lee Ann*		Grand Terrace					X					X	X										
Glaab, Paul*		Laguna Niguel			X																		
Glancy, Thomas		VCOG							X								NM	X					
Green, Cathy		OCCOG			X												X						
Gross, Carol		Culver City		X													X						
Gurule, Frank*		Cudahy		X													X						
Hack, Bert		Laguna Woods			X												X						
Hernandez, Robert		Anaheim			X							X	X					X					
Jahn, Bill		SANBAG						X									NM						
Leon, Paul		SANBAG						X									X						
Lowe, Robin*		Hemet/RCTC						X									X						
Lowenthal, Bonnie		Long Beach		X								X	X					X					
Martinez, Sharon		Monterey Park		X													X						
Mastel, Andrew*		Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians					X											X					

Member (including Ex-Officio) Last Name, First Name		Representing	X = County Represented						X = Attended				= No Meeting NM = New Member											
			IC	LA	OC	RC	SB	VC	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec				
McLean, Marsha		Santa Clarita		X							NM							X						
Messina, Barbara*		Alhambra		X					X	X	X				X			X	X					
Millhouse, Keith*		Moorpark					X			X	X				X			X	X					
Mills, Leroy		Cypress			X						NM				X			X						
Nuaimi, Mark		SANBAG					X									NM								
O'Connor, Pam*		Santa Monica		X						X							X							
Ovitt, Gary*		San Bernardino County					X				NM				X			X	X					
Parks, Bernard*		Los Angeles		X						X	X													
Pettis, Gregory*		Cathedral City					X			X	X							X	X					
Quirk, Sharon		Fullerton		X							NM													
Roberts, Ron*		Temecula					X			X	X						X							
Rutherford, Mark*		Westlake Village		X						X														
Smith, Greig*		Los Angeles		X						X	X													
Spence, David		La Canada Flintridge		X					X	X	X													
Stone, Jeffrey*		County of Riverside					X			X	X							X	X					
Sykes, Tom*		Walnut		X						X	X													
Ten, Mike - Vice Chair		South Pasadena		X																				
Wapner, Alan* - Chair		Ontario								X	X													
Totals			0	25	9	10	8	2																